

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/793,833

Applicant(s)
SCHUMACHER ET AL.

Examiner
William H. Beisner

Group Art Unit
1744



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) William H. Beisner

(3) _____

(2) Gerald T. Shekleton

(4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 2, 1998

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending and proposed claims.

Identification of prior art discussed:

All prior art of record.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The Examiner reviewed applicants' proposed changes. Mr. Shekleton was informed that the art rejection of claims 7-9, 13, 16-19, 21, and 22 would be maintained. The Examiner also pointed out that the proposed change to claim 30 would render it obvious for the same reasons as claim 7. The Examiner also stated that the restriction of claims 32 and 60-69 would be maintained because this device is structurally different from the examined claims. The Examiner also suggested changes to the claim language so as to overcome the 35 USC 112, 2nd. paragraph, rejections of record. Mr. Shekleton will consider the Examiner's comments and plans to file an after final amendment so as to place the application in condition for allowance.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

WILLIAM H. BEISNER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1744

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/793,833

Applicant(s)
SCHUMACHER ET AL.

Examiner
William H. Beisner

Group Art Unit
1744



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) William H. Beisner

(3) _____

(2) Gerald T. Shekleton

(4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 20, 1998

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: All pending and proposed claims.

Identification of prior art discussed:

All of record.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Shekleton was informed that the response Filed Oct. 6, 1998 would be entered. However, the Examiner proposed changes to claims 29, 37, 30, 45, 46, 31 and 56 which would clearly define the claimed invention over the prior art of record. It was agreed to make the changes by Examiner's amendment. See Paper No. 16 for details.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

WILLIAM H. BEISNER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1744